Möbius numbers of some modified generalized noncrossing partitions

Masaya Tomie

tomie@math.tsukuba.ac.jp

arXiv:0905.1660v2 [math.CO] 11 May 2009

In this paper we will give a Möbius number of $NC^k(W) \setminus \mathbf{mins} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{0}}\}$ for a Coxeter group W which contains an affirmative answer for the conjecture 3.7.9 in Armstrong's paper [Generalized noncrossing partitions and combinatorics of Coxeter groups. arXiv:math/0611106].

1 Introduction

In this paper we will prove the following theorem which is conjectured in [1].

Theorem 1.1
For each finite Coxeter group (W, S) *with* $|S| = n$ *and for all positive integers* k*, the Möbius number of* $NC^k(W) \setminus \mathbf{mins} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{0}}\}$ *equals to* $(-1)^n \Big(Cat_+^{(k)}(W) - Cat_+^{(k-1)}(W) \Big)$.

Our method is using the EL-labeling of $NC_{(k)}(W)$ introduced by Armstrong and Thomas [1]. If we give an EL-labeling for $NC(W)$ for any complex refliction group W, then we can state our Theorem 1.1 in the case of any well-generated complex reflection group. But it may be difficult to give a uniform proof because Athanasiadis, Brady and Watt gave an EL-labeling for $NC(W)$ using some properties of the root system derived from a real reflection group W [3]. In [2] they proved this result by counting the multichains of $NC_{(k)}(W)$. Moreover they proved in the case of well-generated complex reflection groups. Our approach is independent to theirs. It is surprising for us that their paper [2] appeared in arXiv when we were typing this paper.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 generalized noncrossing partition

In this paper we put (W, S) a Coxeter group W with a set of generators S where $S = n$. Basic properties of Coxeter groups is introduced in [5]. We put $T := \{wsw^{-1} \mid s \in S, w \in W\}$ the cojugate closure of the set of generators S. Let $l_T : W \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ denote the word length on W with respect to the set T. We call l_T the absolute length on W. Then the absolute length naturally induces a partial order on W as following: $\pi \leq \sigma$ if $l_T(\sigma) = l_T(\pi) + l_T(\pi^{-1}\sigma)$. We call it the absolute order on W. We fix a Coxeter element $\gamma \in W$ and call the poset $[e, \gamma]$ with the absolute order $NC(W)$. Next we put $NC^{(k)}(W) := \{(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \mid \pi_i \in NC(W)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ with $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2 \leq \cdots \leq \pi_k \leq \gamma\}$ and $NC_{(k)}(W) := \{(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k) \mid \delta_i \in NC(W)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ with $l(\delta_1 \cdots \delta_i) = l(\delta_1) + \cdots l(\delta_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k\}$. In [1] Armstrong introduced the order structure of them is as follows: For $(\pi)_k^{(1)} := (\pi_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi_k^{(1)})$ and $(\pi)_k^{(2)} := (\pi_1^{(2)}, \ldots, \pi_k^{(2)}) \in NC^{(k)}(W)$, $(\pi)_k^{(1)} \leq (\pi)_k^{(2)}$ if $(\pi_i^{(2)})^{-1}(\pi_{i+1}^{(2)}) \leq (\pi_i^{(1)})^{-1}(\pi_{i+1}^{(1)})$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ where $\pi_{k+1}^{(1)} = \pi_{k+1}^{(2)} = \gamma$.

For $(\delta)_k^{(1)} := (\delta_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \pi_k^{(1)})$ and $(\delta)_k^{(2)} := (\delta_1^{(2)}, \ldots, \delta_k^{(2)}) \in NC_{(k)}(W)$, $(\delta)_k^{(1)} \leq (\delta)_k^{(2)}$ if $\delta_i^{(1)} \leq \delta_i^{(2)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. It is easy to see that the poset $NC_{(k)}(W)$ is the dual poset of $NC^{(k)}(W)$ (for more information, see [1]).

2.2 EL-shellability

Let $(P, \preceq)$ be a finite poset. Assume that P is bounded, meaning that P has a minimum element and a maximum element, denoted $\widehat{0}$ and $\widehat{1}$ respectively, and that it is graded, meaning that all maximal chains in P have the same length. This length is called the *rank* of P and denoted rank(P). Let $\epsilon(P)$ be the set of covering relations of P, meaning pairs (x, y) of elements of P such that $x \prec y$ in P. Let Λ be a totally ordered set. An *edge labeling* of P with label set Λ is a map $\lambda : \epsilon(P) \longrightarrow \Lambda$. Let c be an unrefinable chain $x_0 \prec x_1 \prec \cdots \prec x_r$ of elements of P so that $(x_{i-1}, x_i) \in \epsilon(P)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$. We let $\lambda(c) = (\lambda(x_0, x_1), \lambda(x_1, x_2), \cdots \lambda(x_{r-1}, x_r))$ be the label of c with respect to λ and call c *rising* and *falling* with respect to λ if the entries of $\lambda(c)$ strictly increase or weakly decrease, respectively, in the total order of Λ. We say that c is *lexicographically smaller* than an unrefinable chain $\acute{c}$ in P with respect to λ if $\lambda(c)$ proceeds $\lambda(\acute{c})$ in the lexicographic order induced by the total order of Λ [3].

Definition 2.1 ([4])
An edge labeling λ of P is called an EL-labeling if for every nonsingleton interval $[u, v]$ in P
(1) there is a unique rising maximal chain in $[u, v]$ and
(2) this chain is lexicographically smallest among all maximal chains in $[u, v]$
with respect to λ.

The poset P is called EL-shellable if it has EL-labeling for some label set Λ.

For a graded and bounded poset $(P, \preceq)$, we denote by $\mu(P)$ the Möbius number of P. If P is EL-shellable the Möbius number of P is the number of falling maximal chains of P up to sign $(-1)^{rank(P)}$ [6].

3 Main result

In this section we will prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 3.1
For each finite Coxeter group (W, S) with $|S| = n$ and for all positive integers k, we have $\mu(NC^k(W) \setminus \mathbf{mins} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{0}}\}) = (-1)^n \Big(Cat_+^{(k)}(W) - Cat_+^{(k-1)}(W)\Big)$.

It is easy to see the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.1
Let P be a graded poset with a minimum element $\widehat{0}$. We put $\mathbf{maxs(P)}$ the set of maximal elements of P. Then the poset $P \setminus \mathbf{maxs(P)}$ is also graded. We denote by $\mu(P \setminus \mathbf{maxs(P)} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{1}}\})$ the Möbius number of $P \setminus \mathbf{maxs(P)} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{1}}\}$. Then we have $\mu(P \setminus \mathbf{maxs(P)} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{1}}\}) = \mu(\mathbf{P} \cup \{\widehat{\mathbf{1}}\}) + \mathbf{\Sigma_{x \in maxs(P)}} \mu([\widehat{\mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{x}])$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and an arbitrary finite Coxeter group (W, S) we consider the poset $NC_{(k)}(W)$ which is the dual poset of $NC^{(k)}(W)$. We put $\mathbf{maxs}$ as a set of maximal elements of $NC_{(k)}(W)$. To show our Theorem, it is sufficient to prove $\mu(NC_{(k)}(W) \setminus \mathbf{maxs} \cup \{\widehat{1}\}) = (-1)^n \Big(Cat_+^{(k)}(W) - Cat_+^{(k-1)}(W)\Big)$

In [1] Armstrong and Thomas gave an EL-shelling of $NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}$. We will explain their method briefly. We put T the set of reflections of W. Recall that the edges in the Hasse diagram of $NC(W)$ are naturally labelled by reflections T. Athanasiadis, Brady and Watt defined a total order on the set T such that the natural edge-labelling by T becomes an EL-shelling of the poset $NC(W)$. We put the EL-labeling $\lambda\ :\ \epsilon(NC(W)) \longrightarrow T$. In [3] they called the total order on T the **ABW** order. They put $T := \{t_1, \cdots t_N\}$ with the **ABW** order $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_N$. Recall that $NC(W^k)$ is edge-lebelled by the set of reflections $T^k := \{t_{i.j} = (1, 1, \cdots, t_{i,j}, \cdots, 1) : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}$ where t_j occurs in the i-th entry of $t_{i,j}$. Then they defined the **lex ABW order** on T^k as $t_{1,1} < t_{1,2} < \cdots < t_{1,N} < t_{2,1} < t_{2,2} < \cdots t_{2,N} < \cdots t_{k,1} < t_{k,2} < \cdots t_{k,N}$. This induces an EL-shelling of $NC(W^k)$. Now recall that $NC_k(W)$ is an order ideal in $NC(W^k)$, so the **lex ABW order** on T^k restricts to an EL-labelling of the Hasse diagram of $NC_k(W)$. They considered the set $T^k \cup \{\theta\}$ with $t_{1,1} < t_{1,2} < \cdots < t_{1,N} < \lambda < t_{2,1} < t_{2,2} < \cdots t_{2,N} < \cdots t_{k,1} < t_{k,2} < \cdots t_{k,N}$. For $x \in$ **maxs** they put $\lambda(x, \widehat{1}) := \lambda$, where $\lambda(x, \widehat{1})$ is the edge from x to $\widehat{1}$. They showed that the labeling as above induces an EL-shelling of $NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}$. Now we put their EL-labeling $\widehat{\lambda}\ :\ \epsilon(NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}) \longrightarrow T^k \cup \{\theta\}$.

We have
$\mu(NC^{(k)}(W) \setminus \mathbf{mins} \cup \{\widehat{0}\}) = \mu(NC_{(k)}(W) \setminus \mathbf{maxs} \cup \{\widehat{1}\})$
$\Sigma_{x \in \mathrm{maxis}} \mu(\widehat{0}, x) + \mu(NC_{(k)}(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\})$
$= \Sigma_{x \in \mathrm{maxs}} \mu(\widehat{0}, x) + (-1)^{n-1} \mathrm{Cat}_{+}^{(k-1)}(W)$.

It is sufficient to show $\Sigma_{x \in \mathrm{maxs}} \mu(\widehat{0}, x) = (-1)^n \mathrm{Cat}_{+}^{(k)}(W)$ to prove Theorem 1.1. First we consider the EL-shelling introduced by Armstrong and Thomas. Recall that $\mu(NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}) = (-1)^{n-1} \times$ the number of the falling maximal chains of $NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}$ with respect to $\widehat{\lambda}$.

Now let c be an unrefinable chain $(e, \cdots, e) \prec \cdots \prec (\delta_1, \cdots \delta_k) \prec \widehat{1}$ of elements of $NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}$. If c is a falling maximal chain with respect to $\widehat{\lambda}$, we must have $\delta_1 = e$ because $\widehat{\lambda}((\delta_1, \cdots \delta_k), \widehat{1})$ equals to λ and λ is bigger than $t_{1,i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ in the total order on $T^k \cup \{\theta\}$. Moreover we have

c is a falling maximal chain
$\Longleftrightarrow$
$c \in \{(e, \cdots e) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \cdots e, \delta_k) \prec \cdots (e, \cdots \delta_{k-1}, \delta_k) \prec \cdots \prec (e, e, \delta_3, \cdots \delta_k) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \delta_2 \cdots \delta_k) \mid$ each part $(e, \cdots e) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \cdots e, \delta_k), (e, \cdots e, \delta_k) \prec \cdots (e, \cdots \delta_{k-1}, \delta_k) \cdots (e, e, \delta_3, \cdots \delta_k) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \delta_2 \cdots \delta_k)$ are falling maximal chain$\}$

Hence we have
$\mu(NC_k(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\})$
$= \Sigma_{(e, \delta_2, \cdots, \delta_k) \in \mathrm{maxs}}$
$(-1)^{\mathrm{rank}(\delta_2)} \times \{$ the number of falling maximal chains from e to δ_2 with respect to λ $\}$
$\times (-1)^{\mathrm{rank}(\delta_3)} \times \{$ the number of falling maximal chains from e to δ_3 with respect to λ $\}$

$$\vdots$$

$\times (-1)^{\mathrm{rank}(\delta_k)} \times \{$ the number of falling maximal chains from e to δ_k with respect to λ $\}$
$= \Sigma_{(e, \delta_2, \cdots, \delta_k) \in \mathrm{maxs}}\ \mu([e, \delta_2]) \times \mu([e, \delta_3]) \cdots \mu([e, \delta_k])$
$= \Sigma_{(\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{k-1}) : \delta_1 \cdots \delta_{k-1} = c \text{ and} l(\delta_1) + \cdots l(\delta_{k-1}) = n-1}\ \mu([e, \delta_1]) \times \mu([e, \delta_2]) \cdots \mu([e, \delta_{k-1}])$.
Now we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1
$\Sigma_{(\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{k-1}), l(\delta_1 \cdot \delta_2 \cdots \delta_i) = l(\delta_1) + \cdots l(\delta_i), \delta_1 \cdots \delta_{k-1} = c} \mu([e, \delta_1]) \cdots \mu(e, \delta_{k-1}) = (-1)^n \mathrm{Cat}_{+}^{k-1}(W)$.

Proof

In [1], Armstrong showed that $\mu(NC^{(k)}(W) \cup \{\widehat{0}\}) = \mu(NC_{(k)}(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}) = (-1)^n \mathrm{Cat}_{+}^{(k-1)}(W)$. From the view of the EL-labeling introduced by Armstrong and Thomas, we have
c is a falling maximal chain
$\Longleftrightarrow$

$c \in \{(e, \cdots e) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \cdots e, \delta_{k-1}) \prec \cdots (e, \cdots \delta_{k-2}, \delta_{k-1}) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \delta_2, \cdots \delta_{k-1}) \prec \cdots \prec (\delta_1 \cdots \delta_{k-1}) \mid$ each part $(e, \cdots e) \prec \cdots \prec (e, \cdots e, \delta_{k-1}), (e, \cdots e, \delta_{k-1}) \prec \cdots (e, \cdots \delta_{k-2}, \delta_{k-1}) \cdots (e, \delta_2, \cdots \delta_{k-1}) \prec \cdots \prec (\delta_1 \cdots \delta_{k-1})$ are falling maximal chain$\}$.

Hence we have
$(\mu(NC_{(k)}(W) \cup \{\widehat{1}\}))$
$= \Sigma_{(\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{k-1}); (\delta_1 \cdot \delta_2 \cdots \delta_i) = l(\delta_1) + \cdots l(\delta_i), \delta_1 \cdots \delta_{k-1} = c}$
$(-1)^{\mathrm{rank}(\delta_1)} \times \{$ the number of falling maximal chains from e to δ_1 with respect to λ $\}$
$\times (-1)^{\mathrm{rank}(\delta_2)} \times \{$ the number of falling maximal chains from e to δ_2 with respect to λ $\}$

$$\vdots$$

$\times (-1)^{\mathrm{rank}(\delta_{k-1})} \times \{$ the number of falling maximal chains from e to δ_{k-1} $\}$
$= \Sigma_{(\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_{k-1}), l(\delta_1 \cdot \delta_2 \cdots \delta_i) = l(\delta_1) + \cdots l(\delta_i), \delta_1 \cdots \delta_{k-1} = c} \mu([e, \delta_1]) \cdots \mu(e, \delta_{k-1})$.
Hence we obtain the derived result. □

Now we have
$\Sigma_{x \in \mathrm{maxs}} \mu(\widehat{0}, x) = \Sigma_{(\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_k), l(\delta_1 \cdot \delta_2 \cdots \delta_i) = l(\delta_1) + \cdots l(\delta_i) \mathrm{for} 1 \leq i \leq k, \delta_1 \cdots \delta_k = c} \mu([e, \delta_1]) \cdots \mu(e, \delta_{k-1}) = (-1)^n \mathrm{Cat}_+^{k-1}(W)$
This complete the proof of our Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Professor Christian Krattenthaler, Professor Jun Morita for their valuable advices.

REFERENCE

[1] D. Armstrong, Generalized noncrossing partitions and combinatorics of Coxeter groups, Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, 2006; to appear in Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.; arXiv:math/0611106.

[2] D. Armstrong, C. Krattenthaler, Euler characteristic of the truncated order complex of generalized noncrossing partitions. arXiv:0905.0205

[3] C. A. Athanasiadis, T. Brady and C. Watt, Shellability of noncrossing partition lattices, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 135 (2007), 939.949.

[4] A. Björner, Shellable and Cohen-Macaulay partially ordered sets, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 260 (1980), 159.183.

[5] J. E. Humphreys, Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 29 (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990).

[6] R.P. Stanley, Enumerative Combinatorics, vol. 1, Wadsworth Brooks/Cole, Pacific Grove, CA, 1986; second printing, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.